NPS ARCHIVE
1965
BARRETT, C.

A UNIFORM RATION LAW FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

CHARLES W. BARRETT

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CA 93943-5101

A UNIFORM RATION LAW
FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

* * * * * * *

Charles W. Barrett

A UNIFORM RATION LAW FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

by

Charles W. Barrett
Lieutenant Commander, Supply Corps
United States Navy

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
MANAGEMENT

United States Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

1965

NC Archives
1965
Barrett, D.

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CA 93943-5101

A UNIFORM RATION LAW

FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

by

Charles W. Barrett

This work is accepted as fulfilling
the research paper requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
MANAGEMENT
from the
United States Naval Postgraduate School

ABSTRACT

Food served to enlisted personnel contributes greatly to the morale and efficiency of the Military Services. Existing statutory regulations and Executive Orders have created disparities in the basic ration systems used by the Military Services. There has been an attempt over the past ten years to develop a Uniform Ration Law, which would be used as a basic document for placing the services under one ration system. Problems which are now inherent in the Military Services are presented and the differences these problems create are discussed.

The author arrives at the conclusion that the systems could be greatly improved even though the basic documents now in use are varied. Further, economies may be gained by more interservice cooperation in the present feeding systems. Recommendations are made to improve the systems now and after passage of a Uniform Ration Law.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	1. Introduction	1
	2. Purpose	1
	3. Background	2
	4. Statement of the Problem	8
II.	THE STUDY	10
	1. Method	10
	2. Findings	11
	Statutes and Executive Orders	11
	Ration Issues and Accounting Systems	19
	Food Service Operations	27
	Procurement and Distribution	30
	Miscellaneous Items	35
III.	SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS	39
	1. Summary	39
	2. Conclusions	41
	3. Recommendations	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY		46
APPENDIX A. Comparison of Rations		50
APPENDIX B. House of Representatives Bill 10313		52

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Estimated Ration Costs for FY-1966	9
II.	Comparison of Processes	13
III.	Computation of Ration Credit	22
IV.	Daily Absentee Rates FY-66, Estimates	23
V.	Effect of Absentee Rates on Budget Estimates	23
VI.	Comparison of Estimated and Actual Ration Costs for U.S. Army - FY 1956 to 1960	25

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

1. Introduction

The Military Services -- Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps -- provide daily rations[1] to their enlisted personnel under various statutes and Executive Orders. Each Military Service has established a means of providing a basic ration that is used in general/troop messes and other special rations required for particular feeding circumstances. There has been no question of dietary adequacy of the basic ration provided by the services, however a common standard does not exist which prescribes the same daily ration for all enlisted personnel of the Military Services.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to review existing and proposed statutes and Executive Orders governing daily rations; consider the differences which now exist because of these different regulations; and determine conclusions regarding these differences. Recommendations for resolving

[1] A ration is defined as food for one man for a day.

some of these differences before implementing a Uniform Ration Law will also be presented in this paper.

3. Background

The Navy and Marine Corps are empowered by the U.S. Code[2] to feed their enlisted personnel specific quantities of food each day. The President is empowered by U.S. Code to prescribe the components and quantities of the Army and Air Force Rations.[3&4] The components and quantities for the Army/Air Force rations are described by Executive Order.[5] There is considerable difference between the Army/Air Force ration and the Navy/Marine Corps ration in terms of the quantities of their components.

[2]United States Code 1964 Ed., Vol 1, Title 10, Chapter 557, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965) pp. 1610-1612.

[3]Ibid. Chapter 435, p. 1445.

[4]Ibid. Chapter 935, p. 1843.

[5]Code of Federal Regulations, 1964 Ed. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964) Executive Order 5932, November 23, 1932 as amended by: EO 7500, December 3, 1936; EO 8333, January 25, 1940; EO 10545, July 16, 1954 and EO 11032, June 19, 1962.

In 1955 the Hoover Commission recommended that "the Secretary of Defense . . . establish a uniform ration for all the services with the exceptions for special services and climates . . . ."[6] There has been an attempt made over the past ten years to develop a uniform ration. This was undertaken by a Defense Ad Hoc Committee on Nutrition which was guided by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council. After a study of food preferences and eating habits of military men, a common ration composed of foods grouped into 16 components was developed. The work of this committee resulted in the development of a Uniform Ration Law. On 10 March 1964, a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives to amend Title 10, U.S. Code and to establish a uniform ration for all the services.[7] No action was taken to pass this law prior to adjournment of the 2nd Session of the 88th Congress. To date this bill has not been introduced into the current session of the 89th Congress. Appendix

[6]Hoover Commission Report, Food and Clothing in the Government, 1955 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955) p. 34.

[7]Congressional Record, Vol. 110-Part 4 U.S. Congress, 88th Congress, 2nd Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964) p. 4895.

B contains a copy of this proposed bill.[8]

The Office of the Secretary of Defense furnished the Appropriations Subcommittee of the 89th Congress, a statement concerning the problems involved in preparation and development of the URL prior to 1963, but offered no indication on resubmission of the bill during the current session.[9] The information was provided in response to questions raised by Representative Flood of Pennsylvania, who had asked the service representatives several times why the Uniform Ration Law has not been submitted.

In addition to the differences in basic statutes and regulations the service's scope of operations is also quite varied. A summary of the operations is presented below:

Army

The Army feeds an average of 468,269 (FY-66 estimate)[10] personnel daily. There are approximately 3100 messes of which the greatest majority are company size, serving an average of 200 personnel. The Army

[8]Hereafter any reference made to the Uniform Ration Law will mean the proposed law contained in Appendix B.

[9]Department of Defense Appropriations for 1966, Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 1st Session, 89th Congress, Part 1, Military Personnel, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965) pp. 140 and 149-150.

[10]Ibid. p. 15.

operates 21 bakeries, 18 pastry kitchens, and 24 central meat processing plants.[11] The Army Subsistence Center, Chicago, Illinois is responsible for the food service program, both resale and troop feeding. The Surgeon General, U.S. Army is responsible for the dietary and sanitation standards of the food program. The Chief of Engineers constructs and maintains all facilities used for storage, distribution, sale, preparation, and service of food. The Commanding General, U. S. Continental Army Command supervises training within the Army Food Program. Zone of Interior (ZI) Army Commanders train food service personnel in the U.S. Army Training Centers. Local commanders at all echelons are responsible for proper execution of the Army Food Program and provide the close supervision at the mess level. Natick Laboratories, Natick, Massachusetts conducts research on the operational development of subsistence items and containers for foods for all services. Training in subsistence management is provided by the Army, for all services, at Fort Lee Virginia.

[11] Subsistence Management, U.S. Army Quartermaster School, Fort Lee Virginia, ST 10-196-1, November 1963. The numbers reflected above are approximate since the publication used was dated 1963. This publication is a text used by the Quartermaster School.

The Army portion of the Subsistence-in-Kind dollar for FY-66 budget is approximately $207 million, or approximately 42%.[12]

Navy

The Navy feeds an average of 346,116 (FY-66 estimate) personnel daily.[13] The number of messes is approximately 1200, of which approximately 1/3 serve less than 300 personnel daily.[14] The Navy operates no central bakeries and only one central meat cutting plant. The Navy Subsistence Office, Washington, D.C. is responsible for the Navy Food Service Program. Policy guidance is furnished by the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. The local commanding officers are responsible for close supervision and proper execution of the Navy Food Service Program. The local Supply Officers are responsible for the menu planning and mess operations. Over 1/2 of the personnel in supply departments are engaged in food service operations. The U.S. Naval Supply Research and Development Facility, Bayonne, New Jersey, conducts test and evaluation of food service

[12] DOD Appropriations for 1966, op.cit., p. 15.

[13] DOD Appropriations for 1966, op.cit., p. 109.

[14] The Best Fed Navy, FY 64 Annual Report, U.S. Navy Subsistence Office, Washington, D.C., (Washington: Department of the Navy, 1964) p. 3.

equipment and recipes for use in the Navy.

The Navy portion of the Subsistence-in-Kind dollar for the FY-66 budget is approximately $157 million or approximately 32%.[15]

Air Force

The Air Force feeds an average of 202,266 (FY-66 estimate)[16] personnel daily in approximately 1000 messes.[17] The Air Force operates 25 bakeries, 80 pastry kitchens and five meat cutting facilities. The Director of Supply and Services Headquarters U.S. Air Force provides the overall policy guidance for the Air Force Food Service Management Program. The Middletown Air Material Area (MAAMA) under the direction of the Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) is directly responsible for the operation of the Air Force Food Service Management Program. The program includes both resale and troop feeding. No food or equipment research is conducted by the Air Force.

[15] DOD Appropriation for 1966, op. cit., p. 109.

[16] DOD Appropriation for 1966, op. cit., p. 192.

[17] Food Service Manual, Department of the Air Force, Air Force Manual 146-1, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964).

The Surgeon General, U.S. Air Force is responsible for the dietary and sanitary standards for the program.[18]

The Air Force portion of the Subsistence-in-Kind dollar for the FY-66 budget is approximately $87 million or approximately 18%.[19]

Marine Corps

The Marine Corps mess operations and data will not be included in this paper since their portion of the budget and their operations are relatively small compared to the other three services.

4. Problem

The existing statutory regulations and Presidential Orders create the basic disparities in the daily rations for enlisted personnel. Although a Uniform Ration Law has been developed, and once introduced into Congress, it will not alleviate all the basic cost differences, because of the different feeding concepts and philosophies now used by the services. This difference can be seen in Table I, where the Army and Air Force which both use the same

[18] Ibid.

[19] DOD Appropriations for FY 1966, op. cit., p. 192.

basic order have a ration cost differential in CONUS of $.05 and $.03 Overseas.

TABLE I

ESTIMATED RATION COSTS - FY 1966*

	Army	Air Force	Navy
CONUS	$1.06	$1.11	$1.14
Overseas	$1.11	$1.14	$1.20
Afloat	-	-	$1.23

*DOD Appropriations for FY 1966, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 1st Sess. 89th Congress.

The basic problem is to develop an adequate uniform ration law which will provide equitable daily rations to all enlisted personnel. An ancillary problem is to develop procedures and policies which will diminish or alleviate some of the causes of the basic cost differences between the services. A uniform ration law which includes all of these detailed procedures is not considered desirable.

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY

1. Method

The quantity of printed matter on this subject is fairly limited. The majority of the material is confined to operating instructions and procedures of the military services. Other material is sparsely located in studies conducted by the individual services and in most cases, does not cover the entire subject area.

A review was made of the instructions and procedures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Marine Corps and Coast Guard were not included because of their relatively small proportion of the subsistence dollars in the annual budgets.

Material reviewed was received from the Army, Navy, and Air Force offices directly responsible for feeding enlisted personnel. The material was reviewed for areas affecting the ration costs, issue procedures, and accounting for issues of rations. A cursory review was made of budget submission procedures for each of the three services. Additional information was obtained from the U.S. Army by visiting the Post Food Advisor at Fort Ord, California.

The material has been arranged into areas which will affect the implementation of a Uniform Ration Law, and which presently affect the comparisons now used by the Department of Defense and Congress when ration costs and service operations are compared.

2. Findings

Statutes and Executive Orders

Existing legislation and Executive Orders do not provide a common basis for establishing and administering the daily ration for enlisted personnel. The basic statutes and orders provide different quantities of food for the Army/Air Force and the Navy/Marine Corps rations. These differences are shown in Appendix A which also includes the quantities for the Uniform Ration Law. These differences in basic quantities between the two existing regulations will create a disparity in ration costs because of the total raw food costs of each of the two ration systems. As noted in Table I there is even a difference between two services under the same Executive Order; (Army and Air Force). While it is unlikely that these differences will be resolved by a single statute for all the

services, it would eliminate the dichotomous situation that now exists between the Army/Air Force ration and the Navy/Marine Corps ration.

Uniform quantities in the basic ration can be achieved by either a Uniform Ration Law or by an Executive Order. Since the Army and Air Force presently operate under the authority of an Executive Order and the Navy and Marine Corps operate under a statute of the U.S. Code, to achieve uniformity, one of the two methods must be imposed on all the services. If all the services are put under an Executive Order, the existing law pertaining to the Navy and Marine Corps would have to be repealed. Conversely, consideration could be given to placing the Army and Air Force under the present Navy Ration Law. If either approach is taken, the existing statutes or Executive Orders should be updated to reflect the latest food preferences of the personnel. A list of the different steps required for processing an Executive Order or a Congressional Legislation are shown in Table II. The use of an Executive Order would reduce the time of processing a change to the regulations by eliminating the Congressional Hearings, however a disadvantage would be the administrative

burden for required staffing and coordination between the Department of Defense, Bureau of the Budget, Justice Department and Military Services. Another disadvantage would be the lack of flexibility to make changes to the order without prior approval of the President.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF PROCESSES

Executive Order	Legislation
1. Originating Military Service prepares and coordinates with other services.	1. Originating Military prepares and coordinates with other services.
2. Forward to OSD for approval.	2. Forward to OSD for approval.
3. OSD forwards to the Bureau of the Budget.	3. OSD forwards to the Bureau of the Budget.
4. Bureau of Budget coordinates with interested Government agencies, if any.	4. Bureau of Budget coordinates with interested Government agencies, if any.
5. Bureau of Budget forwards to Department of Justice for approval.	5. Returned for submission to Congress over signature of Military Department designated as sponsor by OSD.
6. Department of Justice forwards to President for signature.	6. Forwarded to appropriate committees in both Houses of Congress.
7. Return from President to Justice to OSD to Military Service for implementation.	7. Hearings by both Houses of Congress.
8. Subsequent adjustments to ration authority can be developed, processed as above and executed within the Executive Branch, after Presidential approval.	8. Passage by both Houses of Congress.
	9. Approval by the President.
	10. Implemented by the Military services.
	11. Subsequent adjustments in authority can be developed and executed by the Secretary of Defense, without referral to Congress or to the President.

The Uniform Ration Law, Appendix B, offers the advantages of; (1) Establishing a basic ration for all the services, (2) being flexible, and responsive as now written, to change in new food developments and new military requirements (Para. 2513 (d)) without further Congressional action, and (3) delegating the responsibility for prescribing rations to each military department Secretary. The major disadvantage would be the excessive time required for establishing the basic law and for initiating major changes. Considerable time may elapse before a change is affected because Congress is not in session or the workload would not permit hearings on a change.

The present systems in use provide for direction of the military ration by the respective service Secretaries. The Uniform Ration Law would not affect these responsibilities as it is now written. This section is considered imperative, since the Service Secretaries must have the authority to make adjustments to meet operational conditions without prior approval. The present regulations provide for determination of commuted/separate rations by the Office of the Secretary of Defense[20] based upon

[20] U.S. Code, 1958 Ed., Vol. 7, Title 37, Chapter 4, Sect. 251a. (Washington: Printing Office, 1959) p. 6197.

the ration costs reported by the military services. The Uniform Ration Law would not affect this responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

A review of Appendix A indicates the quantity differences which now exist between the present statutes and orders and the proposed law. One of the most striking differences is the change in food groupings and the increase in quantities over the present Army/Air Force ration. These increases will create an increase in the raw food costs of the Army/Air Force ration. However, if the Army/Air Force are placed under the Navy Ration Law their basic costs will also increase.

The allowances in the Uniform Ration Law that are greater than the Navy Ration Law are the Egg and Milk components. These increases reflect the changes in consumption of these products in the services. The milk increases will assure the continuation of milk intakes comparable to the present intakes allowed under the Commodity Credit Corporation Subsidy Program.[21] The

[21] United States Code, 1964 Ed., Vol. 1, Title 7, Chapter 35A, Sect. 1446a, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965) p. 889.

Uniform Ration Law does not change this legislation, but it does present a problem of increased costs to the Department of Defense budget for subsistence.

Under the present statutes regarding the CCC Program the Department of Defense is reimbursed for the value of milk consumed in excess of normal allowances. The present normal allowance is 8 ounces. Under the Uniform Ration Law the normal Allowances could be as high as 24 ounces. The present consumption of milk in the military services exceeds 24 ounces per man per day. In effect the Department of Agriculture would only reimburse the Department of Defense for that amount of milk consumed in excess of 24 ounces. The total cost to the government would be the same, but the Department of Defense budget would have to absorb the cost of the 16 ounces (24 -8) of milk consumed, whereas the Department of Agriculture would reduce their budget by that amount. An example of the magnitude of this increase is the consumption of milk in the Navy during FY-64 where the consumption ashore was 34 ounces and afloat 21 ounces per man per day. The increased cost to the Navy, if the normal allowance were 24 ounces, would have been approximately 6 1/2

million dollars.[22]

The Uniform Ration Law recognizes that it would not be practical to meet the minimum requirements of the law on a day-to-day basis. (Para. 2513c Appendix B) The intent is satisfied if the quantities specified are averaged over a period of time. It also recognizes the requirement for special or supplemental rations which are required for special operational situations of the various services. Presently one of these special rations in use by the services is the Flight Ration.

The present statutes authorize free flight rations for crew members in the Navy and Marine Corps.[23] The Air Force and Army do not enjoy this privilege. Under the Uniform Ration Law all services will provide such rations on the same basis, viz. only enlisted personnel entitled to meals will be issued free flight meals. (Note: Although existing statutes provide the free flight meals, the Navy and Marine Corps discontinued this on 1 July

[22]Memorandum for Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts from Commanding Officer, U.S. Navy Subsistence Office, Washington, D.C. File 5800 dtd. 31 December 1963.

[23]United States Code, 1964 Ed. op. cit., p. 1611.

1965).[24] This law did cause inequities in the Navy, because an individual receiving a monetary allowance for subsistence could also receive a meal without charge if he was assigned as a crew member.

Midshipmen are included in the Uniform Ration Law only to establish their entitlement to eat in an enlisted mess when they are on summer cruises or under other unusual circumstances when it is appropriate. When they take their meals in the general mess, they are entitled to the same ration as enlisted personnel. The Uniform Ration Law does not pertain to Midshipmen or Cadets when they are at the Academy or on leave from the Academies. The ration authorized for Midshipmen eating at the Academy mess, and its commuted value, is established by the Secretary of the Navy under separate authority.[25] The reference to Midshipmen and Cadets in section 2515b is superfluous since it conflicts with Title 37 of the United States Code.

[24]Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Instruction 7330.15 13 May 1965, (Washington: Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1965).

[25]United States Code, 1958 Ed. Supplement IV, Vol. 2, Title 37, Section 422, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964) p. 20.

Ration Issues and Accounting Systems

The Army and Air Force draw subsistence items for their rations by meals computed on an estimate of the number of personnel who will be present for the meals.[26] The frequency of issues each week varies with the type of rations issued, but it is generally a 2-2-3 cycle. A 2-2-3 cycle indicates that issues are made on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. The frequency will depend upon whether the ration is a field or an operational ration. The Navy issues food items to their messes based upon the storage facilities of the individual messes. These issues are not dictated by expected personnel to be fed over a specific period.

The reporting systems for recording issues of rations varies considerably between the services. There are differences in determining the number of rations furnished. The Army determines the number of rations by actual headcount each meal.[27] The Air Force develops an

[26] Food Service Manual, Department of Air Force, Air Force Manual 146-1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964) p. 20.

[27] Army Regulation 30-41, Food Service, Field Rations, Department of the Army, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954), p. 10.

absentee rate twice a year and applies this rate to the activity strength for computing rations.[28] The Navy uses the actual headcount ashore,[29] but permits total ration credit for onboard strength afloat.[30]

Computation of ration credit, even after headcount, varies between the services. The Army computes ration credit by dividing the total number of meals served by three.[31] The Navy computes ration credit by multiplying the meals served by a percent for each meal.[32] The Air Force computation is based upon the absentee rate developed at the activity for each meal and multiplying this rate by the number of personnel authorized to subsist.[33] The total of these authorized meals is then divided by three to compute the ration credit. Table III shows the differences in ration credits resulting from these different

[28]Air Force Manual 146-1, op. cit., p. 36.

[29]Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Manual, Vol. IV and VIII, para. 41055-4 and para. 82112.

[30]Ibid. Vol. III, para. 37035-1.

[31]Army Regulation 30-41, loc. cit..

[32]BuSanda Manual, Vol. IV, loc. cit..

[33]Air Force Manual 146-1, op. cit., p. 40.

computations.

There has been criticism by members of the Congressional Committees of the absentee rates used by the services.[34] During the hearings on the FY-66 budget, the Navy absentee rates were discussed, but none of the other services were questioned concerning this matter. Table IV shows the various rates used by the services for FY-1966 budget submissions.

These rates have a direct bearing on the total budget requests for Subsistence-in-Kind portion of the military budgets. Budgeted cost estimates are based upon the ration costs for the two latest quarters of actual cost before the submission of the budget estimates. For example, the estimated cost of the FY-64 budget was based upon the actual cost per ration experienced from January through June 1962.[35] This cost is then projected

[34] DOD Appropriations for FY-66, op. cit., p. 141.

[35] Department of Defense Appropriations for 1964, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Part 3, Military Personnel, U.S. Congress, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963) p. 51.

TABLE III

COMPUTATION OF RATION CREDITS

Number of personnel authorized to subsist at government expense is 200. Number of meals served (headcount) is: Breakfast: 103; Dinner: 171; Supper: 137.

ARMY COMPUTATION

(103 + 171 + 137)/3 = 138 rations

NAVY COMPUTATION

Afloat

200 rations

Ashore

(103 x .25) + (171 x .35) + (137 x .40) = 141 rations

AIR FORCE COMPUTATIONS

Meal	Absentee Rate	Computation	
Breakfast	53%	200 -(200 x .53) =	94
Dinner	33	200 -(200 x .33) =	134
Supper	42	200 -(200 x .42) =	116
		Total	344

344/3 = 115 rations

for the coming budget year based upon the total number of personnel expected to be fed during that year. During the submission of the FY-66 budget the Navy was directed to increase its absentee figures for budget computation.[36] The effect of this is reflected in Table V.

Accounting to the departmental level for issues of

[36] DOD Appropriations for FY-66, op. cit., p. 141.

TABLE IV

DAILY ABSENTEE RATES - FY 1966 ESTIMATES*

Service	CONUS	Overseas	Afloat
Army	14.8%	8%	-
Navy	30.0	27	6%
Air Force	29.0	15	-

*DOD Appropriations for 1966, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 1st Session, 89th Congress.

TABLE V

EFFECT OF ABSENTEE RATES ON BUDGET REQUEST*

	Gross No.	%Abs.	Net No.	Rate/Ann.	Total**
CONUS	142,903	30.0	100,032	$416.10	$41,623.
Overseas	39,470	27.0	28,813	438.00	12,620.
				Total	$54,240.
Submitted to DOD:					
CONUS	142,903	25.0	107,177	$416.10	$44,596.
Overseas	39,470	22.0	30,987	438.00	13,572.
				Total	$58,638.

$58,638 - $54,240 = $4,388 reduction in budget request.

*DOD Appropriation for FY-66, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 1st Session, U.S. Congress, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965) p. 109.

**Total figures in Thousands (000).

subsistence stocks and rations issued vary between the military services. The Army and Air Force comingle their stocks of subsistence items for resale and troop issue.

The supervision of ration issues and commissary resale issues are intermingled. The Navy operates resale stocks and general mess issues entirely separate.

Reporting cycles of the Army and Air Force are made monthly. The period covered in these reports is the 25th of one month through the 24th of the next month. Exceptions are made to this period to conform to the end of the fiscal year.[37&38] The Navy reports rations issued monthly, for the period from the 1st through the end of the month. The report of actual issues of food is made on a quarterly basis.[39]

For the past five years the data presented by the services to the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee have not been the same for all services. The data submitted from year to year varies, as well as the data for each service. It is recognized that part of these differences between years have been caused by changes in budget submission procedures, but it is also

[37]Air Force Manual 146-1, op. cit., p. 20.

[38]Army Regulation 30-40, Department of the Army, May 19, 1965 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965) p. 3.

[39]BuSanda Manuals, Vol. III, IV, & VIII.

TABLE VI

EST. AND ACTUAL COSTS - U.S. ARMY FY 1956-1960

Fiscal	CONUS		Overseas	
Year	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Actual
1956	$1.04	$ .98	$1.14	$ .97
1957	.99	1.09	1.01	1.00
1958	.99	1.10	.95	1.09
1959	1.06	1.08	.99	1.13
1960	1.12	1.07	1.10	1.12

apparent that items which may be relevant from year to year are not continually submitted. There are no consistent cost comparisons between budget estimates and actual costs. During the hearings for the FY-61 budget, the Army was asked to furnish the differences for the past four years, and they are reflected in Table VI.[40] Since that time, such data have not been consistently submitted by all the services. Another indication of cost manipulation occured in the FY-64 budget hearings.[41] The Army requested "...$2.1 million increase for the introduction of new food items and increased requirements to rotate mobilization stocks..." The budget ration cost estimate for FY-64 was $ .99 CONUS and $1.14 Overseas.[42] A review of

[40] DOD Appropriations for FY-61, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Financial Statements, Personnel and Reserve, February 1-4., 1960 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961) p. 300.

[41] DOD Appropriations for FY-64, op. cit., p. 9.

[42] Ibid. p. 51.

the previous year, FY-63, indicated that the estimated cost was $1.06 CONUS and $1.20 overseas.[43] It is difficult to reconcile an increase of $2.1 million dollars with a concurrent reduction in ration costs of $ .07 in CONUS and $ .06 overseas.

Cost figures used by the services are based upon raw food costs and do not reflect the total cost to the services to place the food on the plate. Costs such as labor to prepare, equipment replacement and depreciation, facilities depreciation, maintenance and utilities are not included. These costs will be required in the Uniform Ration Law. Section 2515b (Appendix B) requires that prices for rations or meals sold "... shall be established so as to recover the cost of the food and the cost of the preparation and serving of rations or meals sold..." Preparation and serving costs (Surcharges) are presumably the difference between the actual raw food costs and the subsistence allowance or applicable portion of the per diem allowance to which personnel are entitled. In other words the government should be reimbursed for any allowances

[43] DOD Appropriations for FY-63, op. cit., p. 18.

paid to an individual who receives any such allowance and also is provided a meal at no cost. The costs now charged personnel on commuted or separated rations do not reflect these preparation and serving costs.

Costs incidental to preparation and serving can only be determined after study of manpower, transportation, overhead, and a breakdown of the mixture of cost between troop feeding and resale. To date, no studies have been conducted of these costs in the services. A complete study of these costs, in the more than 5,000 messes in the services, would ba a costly and sizable undertaking. Statistical sampling of costs related to various mess sizes and types of operations would be sufficient to establish these incidental costs.

Food Service Operations

There are variations between the services in their concepts of food service operations. These differences can be related, in part, to the historical development of feeding concepts of the respective services.

The writer's experience as a member of a committee to develop a standard mess hall design for use ashore by all services, revealed many of the differences. These

differences are apparent in feeding line rates, meal time required, support concepts, menus, food preparation, equipment and manpower utilization. There are no standards established for manpower. The design and layout of equipment in messes in the services has been a haphazard, uncoordinated, fragmented approach which has resulted in excessive expenditure of funds to correct deficiencies resulting from poor planning and coordination during construction phases.

Menu planning within the services varies with each service. The Army and Air Force use a Master Menu which is based upon a monetary allowance of 39 food items. The Navy menus are determined by local activities. All services recognize that menus must vary according to climate and operational circumstances. The Army and Air Force permit local changes in the Master Menu to fit these local conditions. In these cases the Master Menu is used only as a guide and the cost limits established by it cannot be exceeded. The master menu concept has some nutritional advantages, but the variables related to market condition, food preference, and operational conditions cannot be adequately computed in such a menu for CONUS

use. The use of the menu should not be so mandatory that it causes a burden on the local activities. It is useful in planning stock rotation of items, but planning rotation and consumption of these items are two different things. Planning food consumption and achieving this consumption assumes that every man's food preference is known. The regulations pertaining to the use of the Master Menu indicate that unusual administrative burdens may be placed on local commands to report local changes and justification for these changes.[44]

The training provided by the military services for their food service personnel varies between the services. The Air Force provides no formal training for their food service personnel. The Army operates a food technology and supervision course at Fort Lee, Virginia, which is used by all the services. This training is available for enlisted personnel and officers. The Navy provides formal training for enlisted personnel at two locations, Naval Base, Newport, Rhode Island and Naval Training Center, San Diego, California. These two schools provide basic and advanced

[44]Air Force Manual 146-1, op. cit., p. 73-76.

training for their commissarymen. In 1964 approximately 1000 personnel attended these courses.[45] Additional training is provided enlisted personnel in the Navy by Field Food Service Teams which visit activities and conduct training in menu planning, food preparation and service, sanitation, and present seminars on ration-dense and other foods. Training for all Navy Supply Officers in basic commissary operations is provided at the Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia. In addition to the Naval Officers attending the Army school at Fort Lee, the Navy also sends officers to Michigan State University for advanced degrees in Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management.

The limited training provided by the services does not permit all personnel involved in mess operations to attend, therefore the majority of training is provided at the local activities as on-the-job training.

Procurement and Distribution

A result of the 1955 Hoover Commission Report[46] was the establishment of the Single Manager Operating Agencies.

[45] The Best Fed Navy, op. cit., p. 6.

[46] Hoover Commission Report, op. cit., p. 34.

These agencies were assigned specific commodities for procurement for all the Armed Forces. The Army was designated by the Secretary of Defense in 1956 as the Single Manager for Subsistence. When the Defense Supply Agency was established in 1961, the procurement and distribution function for subsistence was transferred to the Defense Subsistence Supply Center,[47] an organization of the Defense Supply Agency.

The present organization consists of the national headquarters and ten regional headquarters located throughout the United States. In addition there are permanent supply officers and seasonal purchasing officers located in the various regions.

The Defense Personnel Support Center manages the wholesale food stocks for the Defense Supply Agency. The various regional centers procure, inspect, store, and distribute food supplies for all the military services. In FY-1964 DPSC procured approximately 85% of the subsistence items for the military services.[48]

[47] This organization has been changed to the Defense Personnel Support Center Headquarters in Philadelphia, Pa.

[48] The Best Fed Navy, op. cit., p. 16.

The procurement of subsistence items is divided into two categories: perishable and nonperishable. The nature of the food determines the category to which it is assigned. Generally, the nonperishable items are canned and dry foods, and perishable are frozen and chilled items. The nature of these two categories requires different procurement and distribution methods.

Perishable food items preclude the use of conventional military or commercial management principles for storage, distribution and inventory controls. These items are exempt from the Military Standard Requisitioning and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP). A large portion are purchased and shipped directly to the using activities. The majority of control over these quantities is vested in the using activities. Storage levels in the DPSC system of these items is controlled by the Regional Headquarters, under the policy guidance of the national headquarters.

Nonperishable items are generally procured prior to receipt of firm requirements from using activities. The computation of requirements for these items is one of the most complicated and difficult functions of the DPSC.

Many of these items are procured on an annual or seasonal basis to achieve "large buy economies." The majority of these stocks are stored at selected depots throughout the United States for distribution to the military services.

Storage locations, both government and commercial, for perishable and nonperishable items are selected to reduce or eliminate back and crosshauling, provide maximum utilization of intransit privileges, and minimize second destination transportation expenses. Inventories are established to preclude accumulation of excess or overage stocks. Control of these stocks is maintained through a reporting system designed to highlight the items in need of immediate action.

Requisitions for perishable items are submitted to servicing regional headquarters and reviewed by regional supply management personnel to determine the method of supply. These methods may be by direct vendor delivery to the user; delivery to a market center for delivery to a distribution point; or delivery from stocks already on hand.

Requisitions for nonperishable items are submitted to the Supply Operations Control Center, Columbus, Ohio,

which maintains stock data on all subsistence items in depot stocks. Quantities requested are directed by this center to the requisitioning activity from the various depots.

One of the functions of the DPSC is the promulgation of price lists for the centrally procured items. The frequency of price list changes is different for perishable and nonperishable items. The frequency of these changes is also different from the reporting frequency for rations issued by the services. These frequent changes in prices cause uncertainty in the costs of rations served. The instability in prices may also cause messes to feed at rates less than they are allowed in order to create a reserve to absorb future price increases.

The Navy has attempted to overcome part of these price problems at the local level by publishing a standard price list for a longer period of time. The difference in the DPSC Price and the Navy established price is adjusted through accounting techniques. These prices (Navy) stabilize the raw food costs and provide a better basis for predicting ration costs. While the DPSC does not control the prices for all items, more stable prices for the items they do control would facilitate cost estimates.

The procurement and distribution of food service equipment and supplies is divided between the Defense General Supply Center and the military departments. There is a wide variety of equipment in use, and support of this equipment is extremely difficult. There is a reluctance on the part of the military services to use standardized equipment. This statement is based upon the writer's experience while assigned to a Defense Supply Agency AD HOC Food Service Equipment Committee. Research and development of this equipment is not coordinated and development of specifications for the equipment takes an inordinate amount of time. A review of the FSC 7300 catalog indicates the dire need of standardization in this area.[49]

Miscellaneous Items

Recipes The Army and Air Force use the same recipes, but the formats are different and each service publishes its own recipes. The Navy and Marine Corps use the same recipes and they are published by the Navy for both services.

[49]Federal Supply Catolog, C7300-IL-N, DOD Section, ID List, FSC Group 73, Food Preparation and Serving Equipment, Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, 1 September 1964.

There are differences in the quantities required for similiar recipes between the Army/Air Force recipes and the Navy Marine Corps recipes. Additionally, the quantities of food required by the Master Menu for issues do not match the quantities required by their recipes. These differences create a hardship on local activities because they must convert their breakout quantities to the Master Menu requirements.

There has been a growing emphasis in the commercial industry on the use of computer programming for menu and recipe planning. To date, the Military Services have not used these techniques in menu planning or recipe use. A program such as this could be used to program menu requirements and reduce raw food costs by computing recipe requirements for the daily menus. Extensive studies have been conducted in this area at Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana and Michigan State, University, East Lansing, Michigan.[50]

Programming could be used for the Army/Air Force

[50] Gerald L. Dawson and Richard E. Van Houten, "Proposed Navy Implementation of the Uniform Ration Law," (Paper prepared for Dr. Borensik, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1964). p. 25.

Master Menu and at large activities for computing daily breakouts for the daily menus. Further modification to the system could be made to include preparation and serving costs related to this activity.

Reimbursable Billings When the annual budgets go to Congress each year, they include the total requirements for each service for feeding their personnel regardless of where the personnel are fed. When the Bureau of the Budget apportions the appropriations, the estimated reimbursables are apportioned to the respective services. The method of handling these subsistence reimbursables is not consistent for all the Military Services.

The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have central billing agreements which provide for all reimbursable billings at departmental level. The Air Force requires the services to bill the activities which were furnished the service. This type of billing requires unnecessary administrative workloads at both the local and Departmental level. There is in effect a $100. or less per quarter waiver between all services, which reduces billings between services which are $100. or less per quarter.[51]

[51] Air Force Manual of Budget Administration, Air Force Manual 172-1P, U.S. Air Force (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959) p. 2-88.

Ideally, a common service billing throughout the Departmental level should be established. This procedure would not save field activities the work required in identifying different service personnel supported, but it would alleviate a considerable amount of "paper massaging" at the departmental level for preparing and certifying bills for reimbursement.

CHAPTER III

1. Summary

Existing legislation and Executive Orders do not provide a common basis for establishing a uniform ration for the Military Services. Uniformity can be established by new legislation for all the services, or by placing all services under one Executive Order. A basic document such as Appendix B will not eliminate all the differences in costs now experienced by the services, because of the very nature of the operating conditions of the Military Services. Section 2512 of Appendix B states:

> The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall establish policies to carry out sections 2513-2517 of this title.

Such a policy from one central office does not exist now. There is no responsible central office which establishes the policies for food service and subsistence matters in the Department of Defense.

Ration issue and accounting systems are not comparable between the services. Cost data submitted to Congress has not been consistent for all the services. Furthermore there is evidence that personnel appearing before the

committees in Congress are not adequately briefed or familiar with the subject of military feeding and the reasons for the differences between the services.[52] Cost systems do not include the total costs for placing the food on the plate. These costs have not been developed and no central office or directive requires the development of a system to include these costs.

Previous mention of the outdated costs used to prepare budget estimates indicates one of the problem areas which is not unique to subsistence operations, rather it has been a problem which all elements of the Department of Defense have experienced. One of the important elements of a cost system is that it should provide up-to-date data for making management decisions. Using cost data that is two years old does not enhance this system appreciably.[53] Of course, the different standards in accounting used by the Military Services do not help either. If the Uniform Ration Law, as written, is passed, more current data

[52] DOD Appropriations for 1962, op. cit., p. 631, This particular citation refers to the statement of Representative Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania who stated "I do not think the personnel people know too much about it. This comes up from below. Where are the characters responsible for this?"

[53] DOD Appropriations for 1964, op. cit., p. 51.

will be required to execute portions of the law.

Food service operations, including menu planning, equipment in use, recipes used, personnel training and accounting systems have not been coordinated between all the services. The evolution of these phases of operation in the services have generally been unilateral service developments without regard to standardization.

Procurement and distribution of wholesale stocks of subsistence items have been established under one agency. The pricing policies established by this agency cause uncertainty of ration costs and budgets for the services. Procurement and distribution of food service equipment have been inadequately controlled and result in excessive costs.

Central menu planning has not utilized latest technological advances to improve the system. Manpower has been substituted for system improvement from menu planning to food service.

2. Conclusions

Evolution to uniformity must be logically planned and executed. Unification requires a high degree of commonness

and a low degree of peculiarity. At first glance, one may arrive at the conclusion that the only common characteristic is that the personnel all eat food. This particular common item was enhanced when the services standardized their food items. The concepts of food service in the respective services have been justified by the peculiar operational characteristics of each of the services. Any uniformity or similarity now in effect has been accomplished primarily because of direction from authorities higher than the service Departmental level. This is an indication that any further unification must come from that level. The enactment of a Uniform Ration Law will provide the authority for the Secretary of Defense to bring about some of the uniform systems needed by the Military Services for feeding enlisted personnel.

The Uniform Ration Law will not necessarily cause any organizational changes in the services, however the general policies which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury must establish could result in organizational changes. Organizational change without concurrent improvement is unsound and conflicts with recognized management principles. Uniformity for the

sake of uniformity is not considered the panacea to all the existing problems. Any policy changes resulting from a Uniform Ration Law should be carefully studied before they are effected.

Solving all the differences presented in this paper will not alleviate all the inherent problems which now exist in the Military Services. The operational characteristics of the services will preclude any concept of "separate, but equal costs." A Uniform Ration Law will guarantee the same nutritional ration to each man in the service, but because of individual preferences for food, it will not guarantee that the same quantity of food will be eaten; hence, costs will differ. Eliminating the problems causing the differences reviewed above will be a step forward in achieving efficiency in this field.

3. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for implementation prior to enactment of a Uniform Ration Law:

a. That a joint service committee be established at the lowest possible operating level to develop for the Military Services, uniform operating procedures for menu

planning, recipe use, ration credit determination, ration cost computation, and ration accounting. Suggested level of committee is from the Army Subsistence Center, Navy Subsistence Office, Middletown Air Material Area (MAAMA), and their counterparts in the Marine Corps and Coast Guard. These procedures would be provided the Service Secretaries and the Secretary of Defense for approval and implementation.

b. That uniform training be established between all Military Services for food service personnel. Existing facilities should be jointly staffed to provide this service.

c. That the Department of Defense establish a cost system for subsistence to reflect total costs. Such a system should be flexible and responsive to up-to-date cost changes and would be used by all the Military Services to prepare budget estimates.

d. That the effective date of the Uniform Ration Law (Appendix B) be extended to one year after the date of passage. The date reflected is not realistic and would be impractical to achieve.

e. That the section pertaining to Midshipmen and Cadets be deleted, since it is already provided for by

Title 37, United States Code.

The following recommendations are made for implementation after enactment of a Uniform Ration Law:

a. That the Secretary of Defense establish a central focal point for control of mess operations in the Military services. Consideration should be given to a Joint Service Staff at the Department of Defense level which would be responsible for food service in the Military Services.

b. That any policies or procedures developed for mess operations consider the operational differences of the services and provide for these differences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Department of the Air Force. Monetary Value of Field Ration "A". Air Force Regulation 145-7. January 10, 1963. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

_____. Rations. Air Force Regulation 145-21. April 18, 1963. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

_____. Food Service Management. Air Force Manual 146-1. November 25, 1963 with latest change of August 10, 1964. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

_____. Nutrition. Air Force Regulation 160-95. March 26, 1965. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Budget Administration. Air Force Manual 172-1P Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.

Department of the Army. Food Service, Rations. Army Regulations AR 30-40. July 16, 1957. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

_____. Food Service, Field Rations. Army Regulations AR 30-41 C 10. January 8, 1963. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

_____. Food Service, Subsistence Report and Field Ration Request. Army Regulations AR 30-46, C 3. May 22, 1962 Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. Food Service, Subsistence Report and Field Ration Request. Army Regulations AR 30-46. May 19, 1965. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965. (Note: This Document Supersedes AR 30-46 C3, but is not effective in all Army Areas at this date.)

_____. Subsistence Management. Special Text for Use With Extension Course of the Quartermaster School, Subcourse QM 300. ST 10-196-1. November 1, 1963. Fort Lee, Virginia: U.S. Army Quartermaster School, 1963.

Department of the Navy. Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Manual. Vol. III. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Manual. Vol. IV. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Manual. Vol. VIII. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Flight Meals; Revised Procedures For. Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Instruction 7330.15. May 13, 1965. Washington: Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

_____. The Best Fed Navy. Fiscal Year 1964 Annual Report U.S. Navy Subsistence Office. Washington: U.S. Navy Subsistence Office, 1964.

United States Congress. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1961, Part 3, Financial Statements, Personnel and Reserves. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 2nd Session. February 1-4, 1960. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

_____. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1962, Part 1, Financial Statements, Military Personnel. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. February 20 - March 1, 1961. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

_____. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1963, Part 1, Military Personnel. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess. January 15 - 22, 1962. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1964, Part 3, Military Personnel. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. March 4 - 11, 1963. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

United States Congress. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1966, Part 1, Military Personnel. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. February 11 - 15, 1965. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Congressional Record. Vol. 110. Part 4. 88th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

United States Code. 1958 Ed. Vol. 7, Title 37, Chapter 4. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.

_____. 1964 Ed. Vol. 1, Title 7. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. 1964 Ed. Vol. 1, Title 10. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Code of Federal Regulations. 1964 Ed. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Hoover Commission Reports to Congress, 1955. Food and Clothing in the Government. A Report to Congress by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Brancy of the Government, 1955. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955.

Federal Supply Catalog. C7300-IL-N, DOD Section, ID List. FSC Group 73, Food Preparation and Serving Equipment. Richmond: Defense General Supply Center, 1965.

_____. C8900-SL. FSC Group 89, Subsistence. July 1, 1965. Philadelphia: Defense Personnel Support Center, 1965.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Dawson, G. L. and Van Houten, R. E. "Proposed Navy Implementation of the Uniform Ration Law." Unpublished Research Paper, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1964.

Commanding Officer, U.S. Navy Subsistence Office. "Memorandum for the Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts." File Number 5800. December 31, 1963. Washington: U.S. Navy Subsistence Office, 1963.

ARMY/AIR FORCE RATION	NAVY/MARCORPS RATION	PROPOSED UNIFORM RATION
Army/Air Force Ration Allowances based upon Executive Order 5932, as amended by subsequent orders.	Navy/Marine Corps Ration Allowances based upon U.S. Code, Title 10, Chapter 557.	Uniform Ration Allowances; based upon House of Representatives Bill 10313, 2nd Sess. 88th Congress.
2 oz. Bacon 10 oz. Beef, Fresh 2 oz. Chicken, Fresh 4 oz. Pork, Fresh	12 oz. Preserved or, 14 oz. Salt or Smoked or 20 oz. Meat, Fresh; or Fish or Poultry	16.98 oz. Meat, Fish and Poultry
2 oz. Eggs, Fresh (1 Egg)	2.4 oz. Eggs, Fresh (1.2 Egg)	4.00 oz. Eggs (2 Eggs)
8 oz. Milk, Fresh 1 oz. Milk, Evaporated .25 oz. Cheese	8 oz. Milk, Fresh or 4 oz. Milk, Evaporated or 1 oz. Milk, Powdered and .5 oz. Cheese	27.72 oz. Milk and Milk Products
2 oz. Butter	1.6 oz. Butter	1.50 oz. Butter and/or Margerine
.64 oz. Lard .64 oz. Lard Substitute	1.6 oz. Lard or Lard Substitute	1.60 oz. Other Fats & Oils
5 oz. Sugar 0.5 oz. Sirup	5 oz. Sugar and Sirup as Required	5.26 oz. Sugar, Sirups and other sweets
12 oz. Flour, Wheat 0.6 oz. Rice 1.5 oz. Rolled Oats .25 oz. Macaroni	8 oz. Biscuit or 12 oz. Bread, Soft or 12 oz. Flour and 1.6 oz. Cereals or Rice or Starchs	10.05 oz. Cereals and other Grains
10 oz. Potatoes, Fresh 2 oz. Onions, Fresh 2 oz. Tomatoes, Canned 3 oz. Beans, String, canned 2 oz. Corn, Canned 2 oz. Peas, Canned	44 oz. Vegetables, Fresh or 12 oz. Vegetables, Dried or 18 oz. Vegetables, Canned	.40 oz. Mature Legumes&Nuts 8.18 oz. Yellow,Green&Leafy Veg. 2.92 oz. Tomatoes&Tomatoe Prod. 11.68 oz. Potatoes &Sweet Potato 5.83 oz. Other Vegetables

ARMY/AIR FORCE RATION	NAVY/MARCORPS RATION	PROPOSED UNIFORM RATION
1.5 oz. Apples, Canned .5 oz. Jam or Preserves 1.2 oz. Peaches, Canned 1.2 oz. Pineapple, Canned .3 oz. Prunes	4 oz. Fruit, Dried or 10 oz. Fruit, Canned or 6 oz. Preserves or 16 oz. Fruit, Fresh or 6 oz. Fruit Juice, Canned/or 1 oz. Fruit Juice, Powdered /or .6 oz. Fruit Juice, Concentrate	2.20 oz. Citrus Fruits 7.04 oz. Fruits other than Citrus
2 oz. Coffee .3 oz. Cocoa .05 oz. Tea	2 oz. Coffee or 2 oz. Cocoa or .5 oz. Tea	1.32 oz. Beverages
.16 oz. Vinegar; .09 oz. Baking Powder; .014 oz. Cinnamon; .16 oz Pickles .02 oz. Flavoring Extract; .5 oz. Salt; .04 oz. Pepper, Black.	2/5 Gill Oils or Vinegar or Sauces and Baking Powder, Soda, Mustard, Pickles, Sirup Pepper, Yeast, Salt, Flavoring Extracts, Spices, as required.	1.61 oz. Condiments

From LX.2
To S10
Forwarded for information.

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10313

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 10, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a nutritionally adequate, well-balanced, and uniform ration for the armed forces, and to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the issuance and sale of the ration and to prescribe special rations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following new items at the end of the chapter analysis of chapter 149:

"2512. Uniform rations: general policies.
"2513. Uniform rations: components.
"2514. Uniform rations: other rations.
"2515. Uniform rations: persons to whom and prices at which to be sold.
"2516. Uniform rations: persons who may be provided with.
"2517. Uniform rations: operational missions.";

I

(2) by inserting the following new sections after section 2511:

"§ 2512. Uniform rations: general policies

"The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall establish policies to carry out sections 2513–2517 of this title.

"§ 2513. Uniform rations: components

"(a) The Secretary of each military department, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall prescribe the ration for members of the armed forces under his jurisdiction.

"(b) Under normal operating conditions, the ration prescribed by the Secretary concerned under subsection (a) shall consist of an allowance of provisions conforming, on a daily average basis, to the following basic ration:

Component	Quantity per ration (in pounds at time of purchase)
Meat, fish, and poultry	1.06125
Eggs	.25000
Milk and milk products	1.73250
Butter or margarine, or both	.09375
Other fats and oil dressings	.10000
Sugar, sirups, and other sweets	.32878
Cereals and other grain products	.62816
Mature legumes and nuts	.02500
Yellow, green, and leafy vegetables	.51125
Tomatoes and tomato products	.18250
Citrus fruits	.13750
Potatoes and sweet potatoes	.73000
Other vegetables	.36438
Fruits other than citrus	.44000
Beverages	.10056
Condiments	.08250

"(c) Notwithstanding subsection (b), a component of a ration may be overissued, if—

"(1) another component of the ration is underissued by the same monetary amount; and

"(2) the substitution does not result in a nutritionally inadequate diet.

"(d) The cost of the ration prescribed by the Secretary concerned under subsection (a) may not be higher than the cost computed at the installation or activity concerned of a representative list of specified quantities of food items that is—

"(1) jointly developed by the Secretaries concerned; and

"(2) prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The list may be changed under clauses (1) and (2) because of new developments in food or nutrition or new military requirements.

"§ 2514. Uniform rations: other rations

"Whenever the basic ration prescribed under section 2513(a) of this title is inadequate or its use is impracticable, due to unusual or emergency circumstances of service, such adjustments and special allowances or such special or supplementary rations defined by component, quantity, or mone-

tary value may be provided as the Secretary concerned considers appropriate.

"§ 2515. Uniform rations: persons to whom and prices at which to be sold

"(a) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service of the Navy, may prescribe policies and standards relating to—

"(1) the persons to whom rations or meals may be sold; and

"(2) the prices at which rations or meals may be sold.

"(b) Prices for rations or meals sold as authorized by this section, at messes financed from appropriated funds, shall be established so as to recover the cost of the food and cost of the preparation and serving of the rations or meals sold. However, prices for rations or meals sold to officers, enlisted members, aviation cadets, midshipmen, and cadets of the armed forces who are not entitled to per diem allowance for travel (other than a minimal per diem for incidental expenses as determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be) shall be the amount to which they are otherwise entitled as a basic allow-

ance for subsistence under this or any other law. Under field conditions, aboard vessels, or in connection with operational missions requiring special feeding as authorized by section 2517 of this title, when members are not entitled to a per diem allowance (other than a minimal per diem for incidental expenses as determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be) and are required to subsist in a general mess due to nonavailability of a separate mess, no charge for preparation and serving costs will be made.

"(c) Receipts from charges made for rations or meals sold under this section shall be credited to the pertinent appropriations or funds from which the respective costs were paid.

"(d) Charges for rations or meals sold under this section may be deducted from the pay of officers, aviation cadets, or civilian employees and appropriations or funds shall be credited in the same manner as receipts from charges for sales on cash basis.

"(e) When charges for medical care in military medical facilities are required by law, the charges covering meals furnished to such patients shall be included in the charges for

medical care and shall not be accounted for as sales of rations or meals under this section.

"§ 2516. Uniform rations: persons who may be provided with

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe—

"(1) each enlisted member of the armed forces who is on active duty is entitled to a ration;

"(2) each midshipman or cadet of the armed forces is entitled to a ration, or the commuted value thereof, for each day that he is on active duty, including each day that he is on leave;

"(3) each person covered by clause (1) who is assigned to duty in an officers mess may be provided rations in that mess; and

"(4) each person covered by clause (1) or (2) who is hospitalized in a military hospital may be provided a ration in hospital food service facilities.

"(b) When a ration is provided under clause (3) or (4) of subsection (a), a ration credit shall be allowed to the mess at a rate equal to the monetary value fixed for that ration by the Secretary concerned.

"§ 2517. Uniform rations: operational missions

"Each member of the armed forces, and each civilian employee of the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard,

is entitled to an adequate ration while he is engaged in an operational mission requiring special feeding. When such a ration is provided, he shall be charged at prices which would have been charged under section 2515 of this title for the basic ration. Receipts from charges shall be credited and deductions from pay may be made in accordance with that section.";

(3) by amending chapter 435 by repealing section 4561 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"4561. Rations.";

(4) by amending chapter 439 by repealing section 4622 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"4622. Rations: commissioned officers in field.";

(5) by repealing chapter 557;

(6) by amending the chapter analysis of subtitle C and the chapter analysis of part II of subtitle C by striking out the following item:

"557. Rations ..... 6081";

(7) by amending chapter 569 by repealing section 6298 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"6298. Authority to live at a receiving station after honorable discharge.";

(8) by amending chapter 935 by repealing section 9561 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"9561. Rations."; and

(9) by amending chapter 939 by repealing section 9622 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"9622. Rations: commissioned officers in field."

SEC. 2. Chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by repealing sections 478, 479, and 480 and striking out the following items in the analysis:

"478. Rations or commutation therefor in money.
"479. Sales of ration supplies to messes.
"480. Flight rations."

SEC. 3. This Act takes effect on the first day of the sixth month following the month in which it is enacted.

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10313

A BILL

To amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a nutritionally adequate, well-balanced, and uniform ration for the armed forces, and to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the issuance and sale of the ration and to prescribe special rations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HÉBERT

MARCH 10, 1964

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

thesB2373
A uniform ration law for the armed servi
3 2768 002 01452 4
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY